

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application, in light of the amendment above and remarks below. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 12, 15, 16, 19, and 26-33 stand rejected. Claims 5, 6, 9-11, 17, 18, and 20-25 were previously cancelled. Claim 31 is presently amended. No claims are presently withdrawn, cancelled or added. Thus, claims 1-4, 7, 8, 12, 15, 16, 19, and 26-33 are pending.

Applicants submit the amendment to claim 31 finds support in the original specification as filed. Applicants further submit the amendment overcomes the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, discussed below, and therefore reduces the number of issues that may be appealed. *Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner enter this amendment.*

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 because the term “the server” lacks sufficient antecedent basis. The amendment to claim 31 in which “a server” replaces “a network appliance” overcomes this rejection by supplying the requisite antecedent basis for “the server.”

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 12, 15, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Akamine, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,629,635; “AKAMINE”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections in view of the remarks that follow.

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.

"A claim is anticipated only if *each and every element* as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "*The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.*" *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

MPEP § 2131 (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit AKAMINE does not anticipate claim 12 because AKAMINE does not teach at least "*configuring a second interface* of the server to operate based on the configuration information, *wherein the second interface is capable of two way communication with a network*," a recitation of claim 12 (emphasis added). Nor does AKAMINE disclose "*displaying* on a display of the server an indication of *the configuration information of the second interface*, wherein the configuration information was received via the first interface," a further recitation of claim 12 (emphasis added). Instead, AKAMINE describes only program execution (e.g., playing a music file) and data transfer (e.g., sending a file across a network) (col. 6, lines 65-67; col. 7, lines 1-31, 59-67; col. 8, lines 1-2). AKAMINE is silent with respect to configuring a second interface of the server wherein the second interface is capable of two way communication with a network (e.g., establishing an IP address for a network interface). Consequently, AKAMINE cannot disclose a confirmation display of such configuration data. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit AKAMINE does not anticipate amended claim 12.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 26, 28, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hollstrom, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,968,365; "HOLLSTROM") in view of

Akamine, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,629,635; "AKAMINE"). Claims 2 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over HOLLSTROM in view of AKAMINE in further view of Linares, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,442,032; "LINARES"). Claims 8 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over HOLLSTROM in view of AKAMINE in further view of Sheridan, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,725,032; "SHERIDAN"). Claims 19 and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AKAMINE in view of HOLLSTROM. Applicants traverse these rejections in view of the remarks that follow.

With respect to claim 1, it is well established that obviousness requires a teaching or a suggestion by the relied upon prior art of all the elements of a claim. Without conceding the appropriateness of the combination, Applicants respectfully submit that any combination of HOLLSTROM and AKAMINE does not meet the requirements of an obviousness rejection in that neither teaches nor suggests

a network interface capable of two way communication with a network;

an infrared interface to receive infrared signals that originate externally to the server and *communicate* user input *network configuration data for the network interface*;

circuitry coupled with the infrared interface *to receive* the configuration data *and communicate the configuration data to the network interface* to provide network functionality based, at least in part, on the configuration data;

a display device; and

circuitry coupled with the display and the network interface *to provide, in part, a confirmation display of the network interface configuration wherein the network configuration data was received through the infrared interface.*

elements of amended claim 12 (emphasis added).

As discussed previously (Applicants Amendment mailed April 11, 2006 at 9), HOLLSTROM discloses communication between a telecommunications apparatus and a

WAP server module and communication between the WAP server module and an electronic utility device (e.g., a digital camera; HOLLSTROM, FIG. 1) but is silent with regard to both configuration of the *interface between* the WAP server and the utility device and confirmation display of such configuration. Respectfully, reading HOLLSTROM as disclosing configuration of the interface between the WAP server and the utility device mischaracterizes HOLLSTROM. For example, HOLLSTROM teaches that a user might “control the functionality” of an electronic utility device, e.g., a user may initiate making a photograph with her cell phone. But, HOLLSTROM does not teach configuring the *interface between* the WAP server module and the electronic utility device, e.g., HOLLSTROM does not teach that a user may, for example, set an IP address of the network interface through which the WAP server module communicates with the electronic utility device. Furthermore, HOLLSTROM does not teach circuitry to receive such configuration data, to communicate such configuration data to the network interface, nor circuitry to display a confirmation of such configuration data. Therefore, HOLLSTROM cannot teach or suggest the above elements included as part of claim 1.

Similarly, AKAMINE is silent with regard to configuration of a server’s network communication interface or a confirmation display of such configuration. Furthermore, AKAMINE is silent with regard to circuitry coupled with the display and the network interface, further elements of claim 1. Instead, AKAMINE teaches a confirmation display of dot codes read by a scanner wherein the display is connected to the scanner or an expansion memory unit (AKAMINE; col 15 line 52-53). Consequently, AKAMINE does not teach or suggest configuring a network interface. Thus, AKAMINE cannot teach or suggest displaying a confirmation of network interface configuration information.

Since HOLLSTROM and AKAMINE, taken separately, are devoid of any teaching or suggestion of the elements of claim 1 recited above, the combination of HOLLSTROM and AKAMINE must necessarily be devoid of the required teaching or suggestion of the elements recited in claim 1. Consequently, the combination cannot make Applicants' claim 1 obvious.

Since claims 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8 depend from allowable claim 1, the rejection of these claims has been traversed for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Since claim 19 depends from allowable claim 12, the rejection of claim 19 has been overcome for at least the same reasons as claim 12.

Turning to claim 26, the Office mischaracterizes HOLLSTROM in a similar fashion as with regard to claim 1, to wit: through failing to distinguish between a utility device and a network interface between the WAP server and utility device. Because claim 26 recites "circuitry coupled with the second interface to receive the configuration data and *communicate the configuration data to the first network interface*", elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1, claim 26 cannot be obvious in view of HOLLSTROM and AKAMINE for reasons similar to those discussed regarding claim 1. Because claim 31 also includes elements similar to those discussed with regard to claims 1 and 26, claim 31 is also allowable for similar reasons.

Since claims 27 - 30 depend from allowable claim 26, the rejection of these claims has been traversed for at least the same reasons as claim 26.


Since claims 32 and 33 depend from allowable claim 31, the rejection of these claims has been overcome for at least the same reasons as claim 31.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome by amendment in view of the comments above. Therefore, claims 1-4, 7, 8, 12, 15, 16, 19, and 26-33 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: September 28, 2006


Paul A. Mendonsa
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778